REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended and claims 2, 8 and 14 are cancelled. Support for the foregoing amendments may be found throughout the written description, drawings and claims, as originally filed.

Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to by the Examiner for certain informalities. The drawings are objected to because of not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Figure 5 to Figure 8 have been newly added according to the specification and claims as filed. The newly added drawings include the features as recited in the claims. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the drawings.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsutsumi (US 5,742,496). Applicant amends claims 1, 7 and 13 to overcome the rejection.

The switching element (MOSFET) 22 connecting with the primary side of the transformer 23 is controlled by DRV signal "a" (described in column 6, line 51 to line 65). DRV signal "a" is generated by the Waveform shaping circuit 6 to receive an output from a PWM circuit 7. This output is generated by this PWM circuit 7 to receive the error signal from an error amplifier 8. This error signal is generated by this error amplifier 8 to compare the output voltage value of output terminal 12 and a reference wave (described in column 6 line 17 to line 47 and figure 4). In other words, the change of the DRV signal "a" is related to the output voltage value

of output terminal 12. Therefore, the switch of the switching element (MOSFET) 22 is also controlled by the output voltage value of output terminal 12.

In contrast to the foregoing cited reference, in the amended claimed invention, the switching element 206 connecting with the primary side of the transformer 204 is controlled by a CLK signal from a CLK generator 201 as shown in figure 3 and figure 4. The CLK generator is isolated from the output terminal. In other words, the output voltage V_{out} is not sent back to the CLK generator to change the switching signal, CLK signal. The circuit structure of the present invention and the cited reference are different.

The invention of claims 1, 7 and 13, as amended, includes a CLK signal generator for generating a CLK signal to switch the switching element connecting with the primary side of the transformer 204, wherein the CLK signal generator does not receive the output voltage to change the CLK signal. The output voltage is not fed back to the primary side of the transformer. In other words, the magnitude in the transformer does not disappear. Therefore, the control method of the present invention does not generate an inrush magnitude current to reduce the power transferring efficiency. (described in page 11, paragraph 3)

When resolving the issue of whether the "invention as a whole" would have been obvious under 35 U.S C. § 103, consideration must be given not only to the subject matter which is literally recited in the claims, but also to those properties of the subject matter which are inherent in the subject matter and are disclosed in the specification. See, M.P.E.P. 2141.02; and In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618 (C.C.P.A. 1977). Consequently, not generating an inrush magnitude current and not reducing the power transferring efficiency functions are created as a direct result of the claimed forming an independent signal generator in the primary of the transformer must be considered in the obviousness analysis. The cited reference, however, does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. In particular, all switching signals in the cited reference are related to the output voltage in the output terminal as shown in Figure 4.

Accordingly, the two inventions are different types of circuit structure in nature. Nowhere in Tsutsumi is taught or suggested that the switching signal in the primary side is independent from the output voltage as claimed in amended claims 1, 7 and 13. Thus, the subject matter as taught in amended claims 1, 7 and 13 would not be anticipated by Tsutsumi.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 7 and 13 are patentable over the cited reference and in condition for allowance. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 3~6, 9~12 and 15~16, which ultimately depend from claims 1, 7 and 13, respectively, are likewise patentable and in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is, therefore, respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP

Benjamin J. Hauptman
Registration No. 29,310

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111 - BJH:jk
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: June 27, 2005

In the drawings:

Please add new Figure 5 to Figure 8 as shown in the attached drawings.